arXiv:1603.06819v1 [math.AP] 22 Mar 2016

Regularity of the free boundary in the biharmonic obstacle problem

Gohar Aleksanyan *

March 23, 2016

Abstract

In this article we use flatness improvement argument to study the regularity of the free boundary for the biharmonic obstacle problem with zero obstacle. Assuming that the solution is almost one-dimensional, and that the non-coincidence set is an non-tangentially accessible (NTA) domain, we derive the $C^{1,\alpha}$-regularity of the free boundary in a small ball centered at the origin.

From the $C^{1,\alpha}$-regularity of the free boundary we conclude that the solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem is locally $C^{3,\alpha}$ up to the free boundary, and therefore $C^{2,1}$. In the end we study an example, showing that in general $C^{2,\frac{1}{2}}$ is the best regularity that a solution may achieve in dimension $n \geq 2$.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 The obstacle problem for the biharmonic operator **3**
2.1 Existence, uniqueness and $W^{3,2}$-regularity of the solution 3
2.2 $C^{1,\alpha}$-regularity of the solution 8

3 Regularity of the free boundary **11**
3.1 One-dimensional solutions 11
3.2 The class $\mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(\varepsilon)$ of solutions to the biharmonic obstacle problem 12
3.3 Linearization 17
3.4 Properties of solutions in a normalized coordinate system 19
3.5 $C^{1,\alpha}$-regularity of the free boundary 23

4 On the regularity of the solution **28**
4.1 $C^{2,1}$-regularity of the solutions in $\mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(\varepsilon)$ 28
4.2 In general the solutions are not better that $C^{2,\frac{1}{2}}$ 29

References **30**

*KTH, Department of Mathematics, 100 44 Stockholm, Sweden
E-mail: galeksan@kth.se
Tel.: +46 87906660

1 Introduction

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a given domain, and $\varphi \in C^2(\overline{\Omega}), \varphi \leq 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ be a given function, called an obstacle. Then the minimizer to the following functional

$$J[u] = \int_\Omega (\Delta u(x))^2 \, dx, \tag{1.1}$$

over all functions $u \in W_0^{2,2}(\Omega)$, such that $u \geq \varphi$, is called the solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem with obstacle φ. The solution satisfies the following variational inequality

$$\Delta^2 u \geq 0, \ u \geq \varphi, \ \Delta^2 u \cdot (u - \varphi) = 0.$$

It has been shown in [1] and [6] that the solution $u \in W^{3,2}_{loc}(\Omega)$, $\Delta u \in L^\infty_{loc}(\Omega)$, and moreover $u \in W^{2,\infty}_{loc}(\Omega)$. Furthermore, in the paper [1], the authors show that in dimension $n = 2$ the solution $u \in C^2(\Omega)$ and that the free boundary $\Gamma_u := \partial\{u = \varphi\}$ lies on a C^1-curve in a neighbourhood of the points $x_0 \in \Gamma_u$, such that $\Delta u(x_0) > \Delta\varphi(x_0)$.

The setting of our problem is slightly different from the one in [1] and [6]. We consider a zero-obstacle problem with general nonzero boundary conditions. Let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with smooth boundary. We consider the problem of minimizing the functional (1.1) over the admissible set

$$\mathscr{A} := \left\{ u \in W^{2,2}(\Omega), \ u \geq 0, \ u = g > 0, \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = f \text{ on } \partial\Omega \right\}.$$

The minimizer u exists, it is unique. The minimizer is called the solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem. We will denote the free boundary by $\Gamma_u := \partial\Omega_u \cap \Omega$, where $\Omega_u := \{u > 0\}$.

There are several important questions regarding the biharmonic obstacle problem that remain open. For example, the optimal regularity of the solution, the characterization of blow-ups at free boundary points, etc. In this article we focus on the regularity of the free boundary for an n-dimensional biharmonic obstacle problem, assuming that the solution is close to the one-dimensional solution $\frac{1}{6}(x_n)^3_+$. In [4], using flatness improvement argument, the authors show that the free boundary in the p-harmonic obstacle problem is a $C^{1,\alpha}$ graph in a neighborhood of the points where the solution is almost one-dimenional. We apply the same technique in order to study the regularity of the free boundary in the biharmonic obstacle problem.

In Section 2 we study the basic properties of the solution in the new setting, and show that it is locally in $W^{3,2} \cap C^{1,\alpha}$.

In Section 3 we introduce the class $\mathscr{B}^\varrho_\kappa(\varepsilon)$ of solutions to the biharmonic obstacle problem, that are close to the one-dimensional solution $\frac{1}{6}(x_n)^3_+$. Following [4], we show that if ε is small enough, then there exists a rescaling $u_s(x) = \frac{u(sx)}{s^3}$, such that

$$\|\nabla' u_s\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)} \leq \gamma \|\nabla' u\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)} \leq \gamma\varepsilon$$

in a normalized coordinate system, where $\nabla'_\eta := \nabla - \eta(\eta \cdot \nabla), \nabla' := \nabla'_{e_n}$, and $\gamma < 1$ is a constant. Repeating the argument for the rescaled solutions, u_{s^k}, we show that there exists a unit vector $\eta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, such that

$$\frac{\|\nabla'_{\eta_0} u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)}}{\|D^3 u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)}} \leq C\beta^k\varepsilon \tag{1.2}$$

for $0 < s < \beta < 1$. Then the $C^{1,\alpha}$-regularity of the free boundary in a neighborhood of the origin follows via a standard iteration argument.

From the $C^{1,\alpha}$-regularity of the free boundary it follows that $\Delta u \in C^{1,\alpha}$ up to the free boundary. We move further and show that u is $C^{3,\alpha}$ up to the free boundary. Thus a solution $u \in \mathscr{B}_\kappa^\varrho(\varepsilon)$ is locally $C^{2,1}$, which is the best regularity that a solution may achieve. We provide a two-dimensional counterexample to the $C^{2,1}$-regularity, showing that without our flatness assumptions there exists a solution that is $C^{2,\frac{1}{2}}$ but is not $C^{2,\alpha}$ for $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$. Hence $C^{2,\frac{1}{2}}$ is the best regularity that a solution may achieve in dimension $n \geq 2$.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank my advisor John Andersson for suggesting this research project and for all his help and encouragement.
I am grateful to Erik Lindgren for reading preliminary versions of this manuscript and thereby improving it significantly.

2 The obstacle problem for the biharmonic operator

In this section we show that there exists a unique solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem. Furthermore we show that the solution is locally $W^{3,2} \cap C^{1,\alpha}$.

2.1 Existence, uniqueness and $W^{3,2}$-regularity of the solution

Let us start with the proof of existence and uniqueness of the minimizer of functional (1.1). Throughout the discussion we denote by $B_R(x_0)$ the open ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$, centered at $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, with radius $R > 0$, and $B_R := B_R(0)$, $B_R^+ := \{x_n > 0\} \cap B_R$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let Ω be an open bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with a smooth boundary. Then the functional* (1.1) *admits a unique minimizer in the set $\mathscr{A}$.*

Proof. Here we use the standard terminology from [5]. Let us start with an observation that the functional J is weakly lower semicontinuous, i.e. given a sequence $\{u_k\}$ converging weakly to a function $u \in W^{2,2}(\Omega)$, then

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} J[u_k] \geq J[u]. \tag{2.1}$$

Upon passing to a subsequence, we may assume that

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} J[u_k] = \lim_{k\to\infty} J[u_k].$$

According to the definition of weak convergence in $W^{2,2}(\Omega)$, Δu_k converges to Δu weakly in $L^2(\Omega)$, hence

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int \Delta u_k \Delta u = \int (\Delta u)^2,$$

and the inequality

$$\int (\Delta u)^2 + \int (\Delta u_k)^2 - 2\int \Delta u_k \Delta u = \int (\Delta u_k - \Delta u)^2 \geq 0$$

implies

$$\int (\Delta u_k)^2 \geq 2\int \Delta u_k \Delta u - \int (\Delta u)^2,$$

after passing to a limit as $k \to \infty$, we get the desired inequality, (2.1).

Next we take a minimizing sequence $\{u_k\} \subset \mathscr{A}$, and show that it converges weakly to some function u in $W^{2,2}(\Omega)$ through a subsequence, and that u is an admissible function. Define

$$m := \inf_{v \in \mathscr{A}} \int (\Delta v)^2,$$

then

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} J[u_k] = m.$$

Let us note that $J[u_k] = \|\Delta u_k\|^2_{L^2}$, so Δu_k is bounded in L^2, and since $u_k - \omega = 0$ and $\frac{\partial(u_k - \omega)}{\partial n} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ in the trace sense for any fixed $\omega \in \mathscr{A}$, the sequence is bounded in $W^{2,2}(\Omega)$. Hence it has a subsequence which converges weakly in $W^{2,2}$, we will keep the notation, call it $\{u_k\}$. We want to show that the limit function $u \in \mathscr{A}$. According to the Sobolev embedding theorem $\{u_k\}$ converges to u strongly in L^2 up to a subsequence, hence upon passing to a new subsequence $u_k \to u$ a.e. in Ω. The latter proves that $u \geq 0$ a.e..

It remains to show that u satisfies the boundary conditions. For any $\omega \in \mathscr{A}$, $u_k - \omega \in W^{2,2}_0(\Omega)$, since $W^{2,2}_0(\Omega)$ is a closed, linear subspace of $W^{2,2}(\Omega)$, it is weakly closed, according to Mazur's theorem ([5], pp. 471 and 723). This proves that $u - \omega \in W^{2,2}_0(\Omega)$ and therefore $u \in \mathscr{A}$.

According to (2.1), $m \geq J[u]$, but the reversed inequality is also true since u is admissible and according to our choice of the sequence $\{u_k\}$. Thus $m = J[u]$, and u is a minimizer.

The uniqueness of the minimizer follows from the convexity of the functional: assuming that both u and v are minimizers, it follows that $\frac{u+v}{2}$ is also admissible, so

$$J\left[\frac{u+v}{2}\right] \geq \frac{J[u] + J[v]}{2},$$

but the reversed inequality is also true with equality if and only if $\Delta u = \Delta v$. Thus if u and v are both minimizers in $\mathscr{A}$ then $\Delta(u - v) = 0$ and $u - v \in W^{2,2}_0(\Omega)$, which implies that $u = v$ in Ω.

□

Now we turn our attention to the regularity of the solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem.

Proposition 2.2. *Let u be the solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem in the unit ball B_1, then*

$$\|\Delta u\|_{W^{1,2}(B_{\frac{1}{2}})} \leq C\|u\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)},$$

where the constant C depends only on the space dimension.

Proof. The proof is based on a difference quotient method. Let $\{e_1, e_2, ..., e_n\}$ be the standard basis in $\mathbb{R}^n$. For a fixed $i \in \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ denote

$$u_{i,h}(x) := u(x + he_i), \quad \text{for } x \in B_{1-h}. \tag{2.2}$$

Take a nonnegative function $\zeta \in C_0^\infty(B_{\frac{3}{4}})$, such that $\zeta \equiv 1$ in $B_{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then for small values of the parameter $t > 0$, the function $u + t\zeta^2(u_{i,h} - u)$ is admissible for the biharmonic obstacle problem in B_1. Indeed, $u + t\zeta^2(u_{i,h} - u) = u(1 - t\zeta^2) + t\zeta^2 u_{i,h} \geq 0$ if $t > 0$ is small, and obviously it satisfies the same boundary conditions as the minimizer u. Hence

$$\int_{B_1} \big(\Delta(u + t\zeta^2(u_{i,h} - u))\big)^2 \geq \int_{B_1} (\Delta u)^2. \tag{2.3}$$

Assuming that $h < \frac{1}{4}$, the inequality will still hold if we replace the integration over the ball B_1 by B_{1-h}, since ζ is zero outside the ball $B_{\frac{3}{4}}$.

It is clear that $u_{i,h}$ is the solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem in B_{1-h}, and $u_{i,h} + t\zeta^2(u - u_{i,h})$ is an admissible function. Hence

$$\int_{B_{1-h}} \big(\Delta(u_{i,h} + t\zeta^2(u - u_{i,h}))\big)^2 \geq \int_{B_{1-h}} (\Delta u_{i,h})^2. \tag{2.4}$$

After dividing both sides of the inequalities (2.3) and (2.4) by t, and taking the limit as $t \to 0$, we get

$$\int_{B_{1-h}} \Delta u \Delta \left(\zeta^2(u_{i,h} - u)\right) \geq 0, \tag{2.5}$$

and

$$\int_{B_{1-h}} \Delta u_{i,h} \Delta \left(\zeta^2(u - u_{i,h})\right) \geq 0. \tag{2.6}$$

We rewrite inequalities (2.5) and (2.6) explicitly, that is

$$\int_{B_{1-h}} \Delta u \left((u_{i,h} - u)\Delta\zeta^2 + \zeta^2\Delta(u_{i,h} - u) + 2\nabla\zeta^2\nabla(u_{i,h} - u)\right) \geq 0, \text{ and}$$

$$\int_{B_{1-h}} \Delta u_{i,h} \left((u - u_{i,h})\Delta\zeta^2 + \zeta^2\Delta(u - u_{i,h}) + 2\nabla\zeta^2\nabla(u - u_{i,h})\right) \geq 0.$$

After summing the inequalities above, we obtain

$$\int_{B_{1-h}} \zeta^2(\Delta(u_{i,h} - u))^2 \leq$$

$$\int_{B_{1-h}} (u_{i,h} - u)\Delta\zeta^2\Delta(u - u_{i,h}) + 4\int_{B_{1-h}} \nabla\zeta\nabla(u_{i,h} - u)\zeta\Delta(u - u_{i,h}).$$

Dividing both sides of the last inequality by h^2, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_{1-h}} \frac{\zeta^2(\Delta u_{i,h} - \Delta u)^2}{h^2} \leq \int_{B_{1-h}} \frac{(u_{i,h} - u)}{h^2}\Delta\zeta^2\Delta(u - u_{i,h}) \\ +4\int_{B_{1-h}} \nabla\zeta\frac{(\nabla u_{i,h} - \nabla u)}{h}\zeta\frac{(\Delta u - \Delta u_{i,h})}{h}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

First let us study the first integral on the right side of (2.7)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{B_{1-h}} \frac{(u_{i,h}-u)}{h^2}\Delta\zeta^2\Delta(u-u_{i,h})\right| \\
&= \left|\int_{B_{1-h}} \Delta u\left(\frac{(u_{i,h}-u)}{h^2}\Delta\zeta^2 - \frac{(u-u_{i,-h})}{h^2}\Delta\zeta^2_{i,-h}\right)\right| \\
&= \left|\int_{B_{1-h}} \Delta u\Delta\zeta^2\left(\frac{u_{i,h}-2u+u_{i,-h}}{h^2}\right) + \Delta u\left(\frac{\Delta\zeta^2-\Delta\zeta^2_{i,h}}{h}\right)\left(\frac{u-u_{i,-h}}{h}\right)\right| \\
&\le C\|\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)}\|u\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)},
\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

where we applied Hölder's inequality, and used the fact that the L^2-norm of the first and second order difference quotients of a function $u \in W^{2,2}$ are uniformly bounded by its $W^{2,2}$-norm.

Next we estimate the absolute value of the second integral in (2.7)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{B_{1-h}} \nabla\zeta\left(\frac{\nabla u_{i,h}-\nabla u}{h}\right)\zeta\left(\frac{\Delta u-\Delta u_{i,h}}{h}\right)\right| \\
&\le 8\int_{B_{1-h}} |\nabla\zeta|^2\frac{|\nabla u_{i,h}-\nabla u|^2}{h^2} + \frac{1}{8}\int_{B_{1-h}}\zeta^2\frac{(\Delta(u_{i,h}-u))^2}{h^2},
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

where we applied Cauchy's inequality.

Combining inequalities (2.7), (2.8) and (2.9), we obtain

$$\int_{B_{1-h}}\zeta^2\frac{(\Delta(u_{i,h}-u))^2}{h^2} \le C\|u\|^2_{W^{2,2}(B_1)}.$$

According to our choice of function ζ,

$$\int_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{(\Delta(u_{i,h}-u))^2}{h^2} \le \int_{B_{1-h}}\zeta^2\frac{(\Delta(u_{i,h}-u))^2}{h^2},$$

so the L^2-norm of the difference quotients of Δu is uniformly bounded in $B_{\frac{1}{2}}$ hence $\Delta u \in W^{1,2}(B_{\frac{1}{2}})$, and

$$\|\Delta u\|_{W^{1,2}(B_{\frac{1}{2}})} \le C\|u\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)},$$

where the constant C depends only on the function ζ, and can be computed explicitly, depending only on the space dimension.

□

Corollary 2.3. *Assume that Ω is a bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then the solution to the obstacle problem is in $W^{3,2}(K)$ for any $K \subset\subset \Omega$, and*

$$\|u\|_{W^{3,2}(K)} \le C\|u\|_{W^{2,2}(\Omega)}, \tag{2.10}$$

where the constant C depends on the space dimension n and on $dist(K, \partial\Omega)$.

Proof. It follows from Proposition 2.2 by a standard covering argument that

$$\|\Delta u\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega')} \leq C_{\Omega'} \|u\|_{W^{2,2}(\Omega)},$$

for any $\Omega' \subset\subset \Omega$.

Let $K \subset\subset \Omega' \subset\subset \Omega$, according to the Calderón-Zygmund inequality ([8], Theorem 9.11),

$$\|D^3 u\|_{L^2(K)} \leq C_K \left(\|\Delta u\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega')} + \|u\|_{W^{2,2}(\Omega')} \right).$$

Then it follows that u is in $W^{3,2}$ locally, with the estimate (2.10). □

Lemma 2.4. *Let u be the solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem in Ω. Take $K \subset\subset \Omega$, and a function $\zeta \in C_0^\infty(K)$, $\zeta \geq 0$, then*

$$\int_\Omega \Delta u_{x_i} \Delta(\zeta u_{x_i}) \leq 0, \tag{2.11}$$

for all $i = 1, 2, ..., n$.

Proof. Fix $1 \leq i \leq n$, denote $u_{i,h}(x) := u(x + he_i)$, where $0 < |h| < dist(K, \partial\Omega)$, hence $u_{i,h}$ is defined in K. Let us observe that the function $u + t\zeta(u_{i,h} - u)$ is well defined and nonnegative in Ω for any $0 < t < \frac{1}{\|\zeta\|_{L^\infty}}$, and it satisfies the same boundary conditions as u. Therefore

$$\int_\Omega \left(\Delta(u + t\zeta(u_{i,h} - u))\right)^2 \geq \int_\Omega (\Delta u)^2,$$

after dividing the last inequality by t, and taking the limit as $t \to 0$, we obtain

$$\int_K \Delta u \Delta(\zeta(u_{i,h} - u)) \geq 0. \tag{2.12}$$

Note that $u_{i,h}$ is the solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem in K, and $u_{i,h} + t\zeta(u - u_{i,h})$ is an admissible function, hence

$$\int_K \left(\Delta(u_{i,h} + t\zeta(u - u_{i,h}))\right)^2 \geq \int_K (\Delta u_{i,h})^2,$$

after dividing the last inequality by t, and taking the limit as $t \to 0$, we obtain

$$\int_K \Delta u_{i,h} \Delta(\zeta(u - u_{i,h})) \geq 0. \tag{2.13}$$

Inequalities (2.12) and (2.13) imply that

$$\int_K (\Delta u_{i,h} - \Delta u) \Delta(\zeta(u_{i,h} - u)) \leq 0, \tag{2.14}$$

dividing the last inequality by h^2, and taking into account that $u \in W^{3,2}_{loc}$, we may pass to the limit as $|h| \to 0$ in (2.14), and conclude that

$$\int_K \Delta u_{x_i} \Delta(\zeta u_{x_i}) \leq 0.$$

□

2.2 $C^{1,\alpha}$-regularity of the solution

It has been shown in [1], Theorem 3.1 that $\Delta u \in L^\infty_{loc}$ for the solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem with nonzero obstacle and zero boundary conditions. In this section we show that the statement remains true in our setting, with a quantitative estimate of $\|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty}$.

Lemma 2.5. *The solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem satisfies the following equation in the distribution sense*

$$\Delta^2 u = \mu_u, \tag{2.15}$$

where μ_u is a positive measure on Ω.

Proof. For any nonnegative test function $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, the function $u + \varepsilon\eta$ is obviously admissible for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Hence $J[u + \varepsilon\eta] \geq J[u]$, consequently

$$\int \varepsilon^2(\Delta\eta)^2 + 2\varepsilon\Delta u\Delta\eta \geq 0,$$

and after dividing by ε and letting ε go to zero, we obtain

$$\int \Delta u\Delta\eta \geq 0,$$

for all $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, $\eta \geq 0$, so $\Delta^2 u \geq 0$ in the sense of distributions.

Let us consider the following linear functional defined on the space $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$,

$$\Lambda(\eta) = \int_\Omega \Delta u\Delta\eta.$$

Then Λ is a continuous linear functional on $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, hence it is a distribution. According to the Riesz theorem, a positive distribution is a positive measure, let us denote this measure by $\mu := \mu_u$. Then $\Delta^2 u = \mu_u$ in the sense that

$$\int_\Omega \Delta u\Delta\eta = \int_\Omega \eta d\mu_u.$$

for every $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$.

□

Corollary 2.6. *There exists an upper semicontinuous function ω in Ω, such that $\omega = \Delta u$ a.e. in Ω.*

Proof. For any fixed $x_0 \in \Omega$, the function

$$\omega_r(x_0) := \fint_{B_r(x_0)} \Delta u(x)dx$$

is decreasing in $r > 0$, since Δu is subharmonic by Lemma 2.5. Define $\omega(x) := \lim_{r\to 0}\omega_r(x)$, then ω is an upper semicontinuous function. On the other hand $\omega_r(x) \to \Delta u(x)$ as $r \to 0$ a.e., hence $\omega = \Delta u$ a.e. in Ω. □

The next lemma is a restatement of the corresponding result in [1], Theorem 2.2.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded open set with a smooth boundary, and let u be a solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem with zero obstacle. Denote by S the support of the measure $\mu_u = \Delta^2 u$ in Ω, then*

$$\omega(x_0) \geq 0, \quad \text{for every } x_0 \in S. \tag{2.16}$$

Proof. The detailed proof of Lemma 2.7 can be found in the original paper [1] and in the book [2](pp. 92-94), so we will provide only a sketch, showing the main ideas.

Extend u to a function in $W^{2,2}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and denote by u_ε the ε-mollifier of u. Let $x_0 \in \Omega$, assume that there exists a ball $B_r(x_0)$, such that $u_\varepsilon \geq \alpha > 0$ in $B_r(x_0)$. Let $\eta \in C_0^\infty(B_r(x_0))$, $\eta \geq 0$ and $\eta = 1$ in $B_{r/2}(x_0)$. Then for any $\zeta \in C_0^\infty(B_{r/2}(x_0))$ and $0 < t < \frac{\alpha}{2\|\zeta\|_\infty}$ the function

$$v = \eta u_\varepsilon + (1-\eta)u \pm t\zeta$$

is nonnegative and it satisfies the same boundary conditions as u. Hence

$$\int (\Delta u)^2 \leq \int \left(\Delta(\eta u_\varepsilon + (1-\eta)u \pm t\zeta)\right)^2,$$

after passing to the limit in the last inequality as $\varepsilon \to 0$, we obtain

$$\int (\Delta u)^2 \leq \int (\Delta u \pm t\Delta\zeta)^2,$$

Therefore

$$\int \Delta u \Delta \zeta = 0,$$

for all $\zeta \in C_0^\infty(B_{r/2}(x_0))$, hence $\Delta^2 u = 0$ in $B_{r/2}(x_0)$ and $x_0 \notin S$. It follows that if $x_0 \in S$, then there exists $x_m \in \Omega$, $x_m \to x_0$, and $\varepsilon_m \to 0$, such that

$$u_{\varepsilon_m}(x_m) \to 0, \text{ as } m \to \infty.$$

Then by Green's formula,

$$u_{\varepsilon_m}(x_m) = \fint_{\partial B_\rho(x_m)} u_{\varepsilon_m} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} - \int_{B_\rho(x_m)} \Delta u_{\varepsilon_m}(y) V(x_m - y) dy,$$

where $\rho < dist(x_0, \partial\Omega)$ and $-V(z)$ is Green's function for Laplacian in the ball $B_\rho(0)$. Hence

$$\liminf_{m\to\infty} \int_{B_\rho(x_m)} \Delta u_{\varepsilon_m}(y) V(x_m - y) dy \geq 0,$$

Then it follows from the convergence of the mollifiers and the upper semicontinuity of ω, that $\omega(x_0) \geq 0$, for any $x_0 \in S$.

□

Knowing that Δu is a subharmonic function, and $\omega \geq 0$ on the support of $\Delta^2 u$, we can show that Δu is locally bounded (Theorem 3.1 in [1]).

Theorem 2.8. *Let u be the solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem with zero obstacle in Ω, $B_1 \subset\subset \Omega$. Then*

$$\|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty(B_{1/3})} \leq C\|u\|_{W^{2,2}(\Omega)}, \tag{2.17}$$

where the constant $C > 0$ depends on the space dimension n and on $dist(B_1, \partial\Omega)$.

Proof. The detailed proof of the theorem can be found in the original paper [1], Theorem 3.1, and in the book [2], pp. 94-97. Here we will only provide a sketch of the proof.

Let ω be the upper semicontinuous equivalent of Δu and $x_0 \in B_{1/2}$, then

$$\omega(x_0) \leq \fint_{B_{1/2}(x_0)} \Delta u(x)dx,$$

since ω is a subharmonic function. Applying Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$\omega(x_0) \leq |B_{1/2}|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)}. \tag{2.18}$$

It remains to show that Δu is bounded from below in $B_{1/2}$. Let $\zeta \in C_0^\infty(B_1)$, $\zeta = 1$ in $B_{2/3}$ and $0 \leq \zeta \leq 1$ elsewhere. Referring to [2], p.96, the following formula holds for any $x \in B_{1/2}$

$$\omega(x) = -\int_{B_{1/2}} V(x-y)d\mu - \int_{B_1\setminus B_{1/2}} \zeta(y)V(x-y)\Delta^2 u dy + \delta(x), \tag{2.19}$$

where V is Green's function for the unit ball B_1, and δ is a bounded function,

$$\|\delta\|_{L^\infty(B_{1/2})} \leq C_n\|\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)}. \tag{2.20}$$

Denote

$$\tilde{V}(x) := \int_{B_{1/2}} V(x-y)d\mu(y),$$

then $\tilde{V}$ is a superharmonic function in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and the measure $\upsilon := \Delta\tilde{V}$ is supported on $S_0 := B_{1/2} \cap S$, moreover according to Lemma 2.7, (2.16)

$$\tilde{V}(x) \leq -\omega(x) + \delta(x) \leq \delta(x) \text{ on } S_0.$$

Taking into account that $\tilde{V}(+\infty) < \infty$, the authors in [1] apply Evans maximum principle, [7] to the superharmonic function $\tilde{V} - \tilde{V}(+\infty)$, and conclude that

$$\tilde{V}(x) \leq \|\delta\|_{L^\infty(B_{1/2})} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{2.21}$$

It follows from equation (2.19) that

$$\omega(x) \geq -\|\delta\|_{L^\infty(B_{1/2})} - c_n\mu_u(B_1) + \delta(x), \tag{2.22}$$

for any $x \in B_{1/3}$.

Let $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ be a nonnegative function, such that $\eta = 1$ in B_1 and $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$ in Ω. Then

$$\mu_u(B_1) \leq \int_\Omega \eta d\mu_u = \int_\Omega \Delta u\Delta\eta \leq \|\Delta u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\Delta\eta\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

and η can be chosen such that $\|\Delta\eta\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C(dist(B_1, \partial\Omega))$. Hence

$$\mu_u(B_1) \leq C\|\Delta u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{2.23}$$

where the constant $C > 0$ depends on the space dimension and on $dist(B_1, \partial\Omega)$.

Combining the inequalities (2.18) and (2.22) together with (2.23), (2.20), we obtain (2.17). □

Corollary 2.9. *Let u be the solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem in Ω. Then $u \in C^{1,\alpha}_{loc}$, for any $0 < \alpha < 1$, and*

$$\|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(K)} \leq C\|u\|_{W^{2,2}(\Omega)}, \tag{2.24}$$

where the constant C depends on the space dimension and $dist(K, \partial\Omega)$.

Proof. It follows from Theorem 2.8 via a standard covering argument, that

$$\|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty(K)} \leq C\|u\|_{W^{2,2}(\Omega)}.$$

Then inequality (2.24) follows from the Calderón-Zygmund inequality and the Sobolev embedding theorem. □

According to Corollary 2.9, u is a continuous function in Ω, and therefore $\Omega_u := \{u > 0\}$ is an open subset of Ω. We define the free boundary

$$\Gamma_u = \partial\Omega_u \cap \Omega. \tag{2.25}$$

It follows from our discussion that the measure $\mu_u = \Delta^2 u$ is supported on Γ_u.

3 Regularity of the free boundary

In this section we investigate the regularity of the free boundary Γ_u, under the assumption that the solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem is close to the one-dimensional solution $\frac{1}{6}(x_n)^3_+$.

3.1 One-dimensional solutions

Here we study the solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem in the interval $(0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}$.

Example 3.1. *The minimizer u_0 of the functional*

$$J[u] = \int_0^1 (u''(x))^2 dx, \tag{3.1}$$

over nonnegative functions $u \in W^{2,2}(0, 1)$, with boundary conditions $u(0) = 1, u'(0) = \lambda < -3$ and $u(1) = 0, u'(1) = 0$, is a piecewise 3-rd order polynomial,

$$u_0(x) = \frac{\lambda^3}{3^3}\left(x + \frac{3}{\lambda}\right)^3_-, \ x \in (0, 1), \tag{3.2}$$

hence $u_0 \in C^{2,1}(0, 1)$.

Proof. Let u_0 be the minimizer to the given biharmonic obstacle problem. If $0 < x_0 < 1$, and $u_0(x_0) > 0$, then $\int u_0''\eta'' = 0$, for all infinitely differentiable functions η compactly supported in a small ball centered at x_0. Hence the minimizer u_0 has a fourth order derivative, $u_0^{(4)}(x) = 0$ if $x \in \{u_0 > 0\}$. Therefore u_0 is a piecewise polynomial of degree less than or equal to three. Denote by $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ the first point where the graph of u_0 hits the x-axes. Our aim is find the explicit value of γ. Then we can also compute the minimizer u_0.

Observe that $u_0(\gamma) = 0$, and $u_0'(\gamma) = 0$, since u_0' is an absolutely continuous function in $(0, 1)$. Taking into account the boundary conditions at the points 0 and γ, we can write $u_0(x) = ax^3 + bx^2 + \lambda x + 1$ in $(0, \gamma)$, where

$$a = \frac{\lambda\gamma + 2}{\gamma^3}, \quad b = -\frac{2\lambda\gamma + 3}{\gamma^2}.$$

We see that the point γ is a zero of second order for the third order polynomial u_0, and $u_0 \geq 0$ in $(0, \gamma]$. That means the third zero is not on the open interval $(0, \gamma)$, hence $\gamma \leq -\frac{3}{\lambda}$.

Consider the function

$$F(\gamma) := \int_0^\gamma (u''(x))^2 dx,$$

then $F(\gamma) = \frac{4}{\gamma^3}(\lambda^2\gamma^2 + 3\lambda\gamma + 3)$. Hence $F'(\gamma) = -\frac{4}{\gamma^4}(\lambda\gamma + 3)^2$, showing that the function F is decreasing, so it achieves minimum at the point $\gamma = -\frac{3}{\lambda}$. Therefore we may conclude that

$$u_0(x) = \frac{\lambda^3}{3^3}\left(x + \frac{3}{\lambda}\right)_-^3, \ x \in (0, 1), \tag{3.3}$$

and $\gamma = -\frac{3}{\lambda}$ is a free boundary point. Observe that $u''(\gamma) = 0$, and u'' is a continuous function, but u''' has a jump discontinuity at the free boundary point $\gamma = -\frac{3}{\lambda}$.

□

The example above characterizes one-dimensional solutions. It also tells us that one-dimensional solutions are $C^{2,1}$, and in general are not C^3.

3.2 The class $\mathscr{B}_\kappa^\varrho(\varepsilon)$ of solutions to the biharmonic obstacle problem

Without loss of generality, we assume that $0 \in \Gamma_u$, and study the regularity of the free boundary, when $u \approx \frac{1}{6}(x_n)_+^3$.

Let us start by recalling the definition of non-tangentially accessible domains, [3].

Definition 3.2. *A bounded domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is called non-tangentially accessible (abbreviated NTA) when there exist constants M, r_0 and a function $l : \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{N}$ such that*

1. *D satisfies the corkscrew condition; that is for any $x_0 \in \partial D$ and any $r < r_0$, there exists $P = P(r, x_0) \in D$ such that*

$$M^{-1}r < |P - x_0| < r \quad \textit{and} \quad \textit{dist}(P, \partial D) > M^{-1}r. \tag{3.4}$$

2. *$D^c := \mathbb{R}^n \setminus D$ satisfies the corkscrew condition.*

3. *Harnack chain condition; if $\epsilon > 0$ and $P_1, P_2 \in D$, $dist(P_i, \partial D) > \epsilon$, and $|P_1 - P_2| < C\epsilon$, then there exists a Harnack chain from P_1 to P_2 whose length l depends on C, but not on ϵ, $l = l(C)$. A Harnack chain from P_1 to P_2 is a chain of balls $B_{r_k}(x^k)$, $k = 1, ..., l$ such that $P_1 \in B_{r_1}(x^1)$, $P_2 \in B_{r_l}(x^l)$, $B_{r_k}(x^k) \cap B_{r_{k+1}}(x^{k+1}) \neq \emptyset$, and*

$$Mr_k > dist(B_{r_k}(x^k), \partial D) > M^{-1} r_k. \tag{3.5}$$

Let us define rigorously, what we mean by $u \approx \frac{1}{6}(x_n)_+^3$.

Definition 3.3. *Let $u \geq 0$ be the solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem in a domain Ω, $B_2 \subset\subset \Omega$ and assume that $0 \in \Gamma_u$ is a free boundary point. We say that $u \in \mathscr{B}_\kappa^\varrho(\varepsilon)$, if the following assumptions are satisfied:*

1. *u is almost one dimensional, that is*

$$\|\nabla' u\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)} \leq \varepsilon,$$

where $\nabla' := \nabla - e_n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}$.

2. *The set $\Omega_u := \{u > 0\}$ is an NTA domain with constants $r_0 = M^{-1} = \varrho$, and with a function l, indicating the length of a Harnack chain.*

3. *There exists $2 > t > 0$, such that $u = 0$ in $B_2 \cap \{x_n < -t\}$.*

4. *We have the following normalization*

$$\|D^3 u\|_{L^2(B_1)} = \frac{1}{6} \left\|D^3 (x_n)_+^3\right\|_{L^2(B_1)} = \frac{|B_1|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2^{\frac{1}{2}}} := \omega_n, \tag{3.6}$$

and we also assume that

$$\|D^3 u\|_{L^2(B_2)} < \kappa, \tag{3.7}$$

where $\kappa > \frac{1}{6} \left\|D^3 (x_n)_+^3\right\|_{L^2(B_2)} = 2^{\frac{n}{2}} \omega_n$.

In the notation of the class $\mathscr{B}_\kappa^\varrho(\varepsilon)$ we did not include the length function l, since later it does not appear in our estimates. For the rest of this paper we will assume that we have a fixed length function l. Later on in Corollary 3.5 we will see that the precise value of the parameter t in assumption 3 is not very important, and therefore we also omit the parameter t in our notation.

Evidently $\frac{1}{6}(x_n)_+^3 \in \mathscr{B}_\kappa^\varrho(\varepsilon)$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\varrho > 0$. Next we show that if $u \in \mathscr{B}_\kappa^\varrho(\varepsilon)$, with $\varepsilon > 0$ small, then $u \approx \frac{1}{6}(x_n)_+^3$ in $W^{3,2}(B_1)$.

From now on $\kappa > 2^{\frac{n}{2}} \omega_n$ and $1 > \varrho > 0$ are fixed parameters.

Lemma 3.4. *There exists a modulus of continuity $\sigma = \sigma(\varepsilon) \geq 0$, such that*

$$\left\| u(x) - \frac{1}{6}(x_n)_+^3 \right\|_{W^{3,2}(B_1)} \leq \sigma(\varepsilon), \tag{3.8}$$

for any $u \in \mathscr{B}_\kappa^\varrho(\varepsilon)$.

Proof. We argue by contradiction. Assume that there exist $\sigma_0 > 0$ and a sequence of solutions, $u^j \in \mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(\varepsilon_j)$, such that

$$\|\nabla' u^j\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)} = \varepsilon_j \to 0,$$

but

$$\left\| u^j(x) - \frac{1}{6}(x_n)^3_+ \right\|_{W^{3,2}(B_1)} > \sigma_0 > 0. \tag{3.9}$$

According to assumption 4 in Definition 3.3, $\|D^3 u^j\|_{L^2(B_2)} < \kappa$ and according to assumption 2 the functions u^j are vanishing on an open subset of B_2. Therefore it follows from the Poincaré inequality that $\|u^j\|_{W^{3,2}(B_2)} \leq C(\varrho, n)\kappa$. Hence up to a subsequence $u^j \rightharpoonup u^0$ weakly in $W^{3,2}(B_2)$, $u^j \to u^0$ strongly in $W^{2,2}(B_2)$ and according to Corollary 2.9 $u^j \to u^0$ in $C^{1,\alpha}(B_{3/2})$. Hence

$$\|\nabla' u^0\|_{W^{1,2}(B_2)} = \lim_{j\to\infty} \|\nabla' u^j\|_{W^{1,2}(B_2)} \leq \lim_{j\to\infty} \varepsilon_j = 0.$$

This implies that u^0 is a 1-dimensional solution (depending only on the variable x_n). Example 3.1 tells us that one-dimensional solutions in the interval $(-2, 2)$ have the form

$$u^0(x_n) = c_1(x_n - a_1)^3_- + c_2(x_n - a_2)^3_+,$$

where $c_1, c_2 \geq 0$ and $-2 \leq a_1 \leq a_2 \leq 2$ are constants. According to assumption 3 in Definition 3.3, $u^0 = c(x_n - a)^3_+$. In order to obtain a contradiction to assumption (3.9), we need to show that $u^j \to u_0 = \frac{1}{6}(x_n)^3_+$ in $W^{3,2}(B_1)$. The proof of the last statement can be done in two steps.

Step 1: We show that

$$u^j \to c(x_n - a)^3_+ \ \text{ in } W^{3,2}(B_1). \tag{3.10}$$

Denote $u^j_n := \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x_n} \in W^{2,2}(B_2)$, $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and let $\zeta \in C^\infty_0(B_{\frac{3}{2}})$ be a nonnegative function, such that $\zeta \equiv 1$ in B_1. According to Lemma 2.4,

$$0 \geq \int_{B_2} \Delta(\zeta u^j_n)\Delta u^j_n = \int_{B_2} u^j_n \Delta\zeta \Delta u^j_n + \int_{B_2} \zeta(\Delta u^j_n)^2 + 2\int_{B_2} \nabla\zeta\nabla u^j_n \Delta u^j_n,$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{j\to\infty} \int_{B_2} \zeta(\Delta u^j_n)^2 &\leq -\lim_{j\to\infty} \int_{B_2} u^j_n \Delta\zeta\Delta u^j_n - 2\lim_{j\to\infty} \int_{B_2} \nabla\zeta\nabla u^j_n \Delta u^j_n \\ &= -\int_{B_2} u^0_n \Delta\zeta\Delta u^0_n - 2\int_{B_2} \nabla\zeta\nabla u^0_n\Delta u^0_n = \int_{B_2} \zeta(\Delta u^0_n)^2, \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

where in the last step we used integration by parts.

On the other hand, since $\Delta u^j_n \rightharpoonup \Delta u^0_n$ weakly in $L^2(B_2)$, it follows that

$$\liminf_{j\to\infty} \int_{B_2} \zeta(\Delta u^j_n)^2 \geq \int_{B_2} \zeta(\Delta u^0_n)^2. \tag{3.12}$$

Therefore, we may conclude from (3.11) and (3.12) that

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \int_{B_2} \zeta(\Delta u^j_n)^2 = \int_{B_2} \zeta(\Delta u^0_n)^2.$$

Hence we obtain

$$\frac{\partial \Delta u^j}{\partial x_n} \to \frac{\partial \Delta u^0}{\partial x_n} \text{ in } \ L^2(B_1).$$

Similarly $\frac{\partial \Delta u^j}{\partial x_i} \to 0$ in $L^2(B_1)$, for $i = 1, ..., n-1$. Knowing that

$$\|\nabla \Delta u^j - \nabla \Delta u^0\|_{L^2(B_1)} \to 0, \ \text{ and } \ \|u^j - u^0\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)} \to 0,$$

we may apply the Calderón-Zygmund inequality, and conclude (3.10). Recalling that $\|D^3 u^j\|_{L^2(B_1)} = \omega_n$, we see that

$$\|D^3 u^0\|_{L^2(B_1)} = \omega_n. \tag{3.13}$$

Since $u^0 = c(x_n - a)_+^3 \geq 0$, it follows that

$$\|D^3 u^0\|^2_{L^2(B_1)} = c^2 \mathcal{L}^n(B_1 \cap \{x_n > a\}) > 0,$$

hence

$$c > 0 \ \text{ and } \ a < 1. \tag{3.14}$$

Step 2: We show that $a = 0$ and $c = \frac{1}{6}$. Taking into account that $u^j \to u^0$ in $C^{1,\alpha}$ and $u^j(0) = 0$, we conclude that $u^0(0) = 0$, thus $a \geq 0$. Assume that $a > 0$. Since $0 \in \Gamma_j$, and Ω_j is an NTA domain, there exists $P_j = P(r, 0) \in \Omega_j$, for $0 < r < \min(\varrho, a/2)$ as in the corkscrew conditon,

$$\varrho r < |P_j| < r \text{ and } dist(P_j, \partial\Omega_j) > \varrho r.$$

Therefore up to a subsequence $P_j \to P_0$, hence $\ r\varrho \leq |P_0| \leq r, \ \ B_{r'}(P_0) \subset \Omega_j$, for all j large enough, where $0 < r' < r\varrho$ is a fixed number. Since we have chosen $r < a/2$, we may conclude that

$$B_{r'}(P_0) \subset \{x_n < a\} \cap \Omega_j.$$

Thus Δu^j is a sequence of harmonic functions in the ball $B_{r'}(P_0)$, and therefore

$$\Delta u^j \to 0 \ \text{ locally uniformly in } B_{r'}(P_0), \tag{3.15}$$

according to (3.10).

Let $Q := e_n$, then $u^0(Q) = c(1-a)^3 > 0$, since $u^j \to u^0$ uniformly in $B_{3/2}$, we see that $u^j(Q) > 0$ for large j, and $Q \in \Omega_j$. Therefore there exists a Harnack chain connecting P_0 with Q; $\{B_{r_1}(x^1), B_{r_2}(x^2), ..., B_{r_l}(x^l)\} \subset \Omega_j$, whose length l does not depend on j. Denote by $K^j := \cup_i B_{r_i}(x^i) \subset\subset \Omega_j$, and let $V^j \subset\subset K^j \subset\subset \Omega_j$ where V^j is a regular domain, such that $dist(K^j, \partial V^j)$ and $dist(V^j, \partial\Omega_j)$ depend only on r and ϱ.

Let w_+^j be a harmonic function in V^j, with boundary conditions $w_+^j = (\Delta u^j)_+ \geq 0$ on ∂V^j, then $w_+^j - \Delta u^j$ is a harmonic function in V^j, and $w_+^j - \Delta u^j = (\Delta u^j)_- \geq 0$ on ∂V^j , hence

$$0 \leq w_+^j - \Delta u^j \leq \|(\Delta u^j)_-\|_{L^\infty(V^j)} \text{ in } \ V^j. \tag{3.16}$$

Let us observe that $\Delta u^j \to \Delta u^0 = 6c(x_n - a)_+$ implies that $\|(\Delta u^j)_-\|_{L^2(B_2)} \to 0$. Since $(\Delta u^j)_-$ is a subharmonic function in Ω_j, and $V^j \subset\subset \Omega_j$ it follows that

$$\|(\Delta u^j)_-\|_{L^\infty(V^j)} \leq C(n, r, \varrho)\|(\Delta u^j)_-\|_{L^2(B_2)} \to 0.$$

So w_+^j is a nonnegative harmonic function in V^j, and by the Harnack inequality

$$C_H \inf_{B_{r_l}(x^l)} w_+^j \geq \sup_{B_{r_l}(x^l)} w_+^j \geq w_+^j(e_n) \geq \Delta u^j(e_n) \geq \frac{1}{2}\Delta u_0(e_n) = 3c(1-a),$$

if j is large, where C_H is the constant in Harnack's inequality, it depends on ϱ and r but not on j. Denote $C(a,c) := 3c(1-a) > 0$ by (3.14). Applying the Harnack inequality again, we see that

$$C_H \inf_{B_{r_{l-1}}(x^{l-1})} w_+^j \geq \sup_{B_{r_{l-1}}(x^{l-1})} w_+^j \geq \inf_{B_{r_l}(x^l)} w_+^j > \frac{C(a,c)}{C_H}.$$

Inductively, we obtain that

$$C_H \inf_{B_{r_1}(x^1)} w_+^j \geq \sup_{B_{r_1}(x^1)} w_+^j > \frac{C(a,c)}{C_H^{l-1}}, \tag{3.17}$$

where l does not depend on j. Hence $w_+^j(P_0) \geq \frac{C(a,c)}{C_H^l}$ for all j large, and according to (3.16),

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \Delta u^j(P_0) \geq \frac{C(a,c)}{C_H^l} > 0,$$

the latter contradicts (3.15). Therefore we may conclude that $a = 0$.

Recalling that $\|D^3 u^0\|_{L^2(B_1)} = \omega_n$, we see that $c = \frac{1}{6}$, but then we obtain $u^j \to \frac{1}{6}(x_n)_+^3$ in $W^{3,2}(B_1)$ which is a contradiction, since we assumed (3.9). □

Lemma 3.4 has an important corollary, which will be very useful in our later discussion.

Corollary 3.5. *Let u be the solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem, $u \in \mathscr{B}_\kappa^\varrho(\varepsilon)$. Then for any fixed $t > 0$ we have that $u(x) = 0$ in $B_2 \cap \{x_n < -t\}$, provided $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(t) > 0$ is small.*

Proof. Once again we argue by contradiction. Assume that there exist $t_0 > 0$ and a sequence of solutions $u_j \in \mathscr{B}_\kappa^\varrho(\varepsilon_j)$, $\varepsilon_j \to 0$, such that $x^j \in B_2 \cap \Gamma_j$, and $x_n^j < -t_0$. For $0 < r < \min(\varrho, t_0/2)$ choose $P^j = P(r, x^j) \in \Omega_j$ as in the corkscrew condition,

$$r\varrho < |x^j - P^j| < r, \quad B_{r\varrho}(P^j) \subset \Omega_j.$$

Upon passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $P^j \to P^0$. Fix $0 < r' < r\varrho$, then for large j

$$B_{r'}(P^0) \subset\subset \Omega_j \cap \{x_n < 0\}.$$

Hence Δu^j is a sequence of harmonic functions in $B_{r'}(P^0)$. According to Lemma 3.4, $u^j \to \frac{1}{6}(x_n)_+^3$, and therefore $\Delta u^j \to 0$ in $B_{r'}(P^0)$, and $\Delta u^j(e_n) \to 1$. Since Ω_j is an NTA domain, there exists a Harnack chain connecting P^0 with $Q := e_n \in \Omega_j$; $\{B_{r_1}(x^1), B_{r_2}(x^2), ..., B_{r_k}(x^k)\} \subset \Omega_j$, whose length does not depend on j. Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 3.4, we will obtain a contradiction to $\Delta u_j \to 0$ in $B_{r'}(P^0)$. □

3.3 Linearization

Let $\{u^j\}$ be a sequence of solutions in $\Omega \supset\supset B_2$, $u^j \in \mathscr{B}^g_\kappa(\varepsilon_j)$, and assume that $\varepsilon_j \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$. It follows from Lemma 3.4, that up to a subsequence

$$u^j \to \frac{1}{6}(x_n)^3_+ \quad \text{in} \quad W^{2,2}(B_2) \cap C^{1,\alpha}_{loc}(B_2). \tag{3.18}$$

Let us denote

$$\delta^j_i := \left\| \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}.$$

Without loss of generality we may assume that $\delta^j_i > 0$, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Indeed, if $\delta^j_i = 0$ for all $j \geq J_0$ large, then u^j does not depend on the variable x_i, and the problem reduces to a lower dimensional case. Otherwise we may pass to a subsequence satisfying $\delta^j_i > 0$ for all j.

Denote

$$v^j_i := \frac{1}{\delta^j_i}\frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x_i}, \text{ for } i = 1, ..., n-1, \tag{3.19}$$

then $\|v^j_i\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)} = 1$. Therefore up to a subsequence v^j_i converges to a function v^0_i weakly in $W^{2,2}(B_2)$ and strongly in $W^{1,2}(B_2)$. For the further discussion we need strong convergence $v^j_i \to v^0_i$ in $W^{2,2}$, at least locally.

Lemma 3.6. *Assume that $\{u^j\}$ is a sequence of solutions in $\Omega \supset\supset B_2$, $u^j \in \mathscr{B}^g_\kappa(\varepsilon_j)$, $\varepsilon_j \to 0$. Let v^j_i be the sequence given by* (3.19)*, and assume that $v^j_i \rightharpoonup v^0_i$ weakly in $W^{2,2}(B_2)$, strongly in $W^{1,2}(B_2)$, for $i = 1, ..., n-1$, then*

$$\Delta^2 v^0_i = 0 \text{ in } B^+_2, \quad v^0_i \equiv 0 \text{ in } B_2 \setminus B^+_2. \tag{3.20}$$

Furthermore,

$$\|v^j_i - v^0_i\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)} \to 0. \tag{3.21}$$

Proof. Denote by $\Omega_j := \Omega_{u^j}$, $\Gamma_j := \Gamma_{u^j}$. It follows from Corollary 3.5 that $v^0_i \equiv 0$ in $B_2 \setminus B^+_2$, hence $v^0_i = |\nabla v^0_i| = 0$ on $\{x_n = 0\} \cap B_2$ in the trace sense. Moreover, if $K \subset\subset B^+_2$ is an open subset, then $K \subset \Omega_j$ for large j by (3.18). Hence $\Delta^2 v^j_i = 0$ in K, and therefore $\Delta^2 v^0_i = 0$ in B^+_2, and (3.20) is proved.

Now let us proceed to the proof of the strong convergence. Let $\zeta \in C^\infty_0(B_{\frac{3}{2}})$ be a nonnegative function, such that $\zeta \equiv 1$ in B_1. It follows from (3.20) that

$$0 = \int_{B_{\frac{3}{2}}} \Delta v^0_i \Delta(\zeta v^0_i) = \int_{B_{\frac{3}{2}}} v^0_i \Delta\zeta\Delta v^0_i + \int_{B_{\frac{3}{2}}} \zeta(\Delta v^0_i)^2 + 2\int_{B_{\frac{3}{2}}} \nabla\zeta\nabla v^0_i \Delta v^0_i. \tag{3.22}$$

According to Lemma 2.4

$$0 \geq \int_{B_{\frac{3}{2}}} \Delta(\zeta v^j_i)\Delta v^j_i = \int_{B_{\frac{3}{2}}} v^j_i \Delta\zeta\Delta v^j_i + \int_{B_{\frac{3}{2}}} \zeta(\Delta v^j_i)^2 + 2\int_{B_{\frac{3}{2}}} \nabla\zeta\nabla v^j_i \Delta v^j_i, \tag{3.23}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{j\to\infty} \int_{B_{\frac{3}{2}}} \zeta(\Delta v^j_i)^2 &\leq -\lim_{j\to\infty} \int_{B_{\frac{3}{2}}} v^j_i \Delta\zeta\Delta v^j_i - 2\lim_{j\to\infty} \int_{B_{\frac{3}{2}}} \nabla\zeta\nabla v^j_i \Delta v^j_i \\ &= -\int_{B_{\frac{3}{2}}} v^0_i \Delta\zeta\Delta v^0_i - 2\int_{B_{\frac{3}{2}}} \nabla\zeta\nabla v^0_i \Delta v^0_i,\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $v_i^j \to v_i^0$ in $W^{1,2}(B_2)$ and $\Delta v_i^j \rightharpoonup \Delta v_i^0$ in $L^2(B_2)$.

From the last inequality and (3.22) we may conclude that

$$\limsup_{j\to\infty} \int_{B_{\frac{3}{2}}} \zeta(\Delta v_i^j)^2 \le \int_{B_{\frac{3}{2}}} \zeta(\Delta v_i^0)^2. \tag{3.24}$$

On the other hand

$$\liminf_{j\to\infty} \int_{B_{\frac{3}{2}}} \zeta(\Delta v_i^j)^2 \ge \int_{B_{\frac{3}{2}}} \zeta(\Delta v_i^0)^2 \tag{3.25}$$

follows from the weak convergence $\Delta v_i^j \rightharpoonup \Delta v_i^0$ in $L^2(B_2)$, and we may conclude from (3.24) and (3.25) that

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \int_{B_{\frac{3}{2}}} \zeta(\Delta v_i^j)^2 = \int_{B_{\frac{3}{2}}} \zeta(\Delta v_i^0)^2.$$

Hence we obtain $\|\Delta v_i^j - \Delta v_i^0\|_{L^2(B_1)} \to 0$, and therefore $v_i^j \to v_i^0$ in $W^{2,2}(B_1)$ according to the Calderón-Zygmund inequality. □

In the next proposition we use Lemma 3.6 in order to estimate $\|\nabla' u\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)}$ by $\|\nabla' \Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)}$, for a solution $u \in \mathscr{B}_\kappa^\varrho(\varepsilon)$.

Proposition 3.7. *For any $\delta > 0$, there exists a constant $c(\delta) \ge 1$, and $\varepsilon(\delta) > 0$, such that the inequality*

$$\|\nabla' u\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)} \le c(\delta) \|\nabla' \Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \delta \|\nabla' u\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}, \tag{3.26}$$

holds for any $u \in \mathscr{B}_\kappa^\varrho(\varepsilon)$, if $\varepsilon \le \varepsilon(\delta)$.

Proof. According to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it is enough to show that for any $i \in \{1, ..., n-1\}$, the inequality

$$\left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)} \le c(\delta) \left\| \frac{\partial \Delta u}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \delta \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}$$

holds for $u \in \mathscr{B}_\kappa^\varrho(\varepsilon)$, provided ε is small enough. We argue by contradiction. Assume that there exists a sequence of solutions $u^j \in \mathscr{B}_\kappa^\varrho(\varepsilon_j)$, such that $\varepsilon_j \to 0$, but

$$\left\| \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)} > j \left\| \frac{\partial \Delta u^j}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \delta_0 \left\| \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)} \tag{3.27}$$

for some $\delta_0 > 0$.

Let v_i^j be the corresponding sequence, given by (3.19). The inequality (3.27) implies that

$$\|\Delta v_i^j\|_{L^2(B_1)} \le \frac{1}{j}, \text{ and } \|v_i^j\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)} \ge \delta_0, \quad \text{for any } j. \tag{3.28}$$

According to Lemma 3.6, $v_i^j \to v_i^0$ in $W^{2,2}(B_1)$, and $v_i^0 = 0$ in $B_1 \setminus B_1^+$. After passing to the limit in (3.28), we obtain

$$\Delta v_i^0 = 0 \text{ in } B_1 \text{ and } \|v_i^0\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)} \ge \delta_0.$$

So v_i^0 is a harmonic function in the unit ball B_1, vanishing in $B_1 \setminus B_1^+$, hence $v_i^0 \equiv 0$ in B_1. This contradicts $\|v_i^0\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)} \ge \delta_0$.

□

3.4 Properties of solutions in a normalized coordinate system

Let us define

$$u_{r,x_0}(x) := \frac{u(rx+x_0)}{r^3}, \text{ for } x_0 \in \Gamma_u,\ x \in B_2,\ r \in (0,1), \tag{3.29}$$

and $u_r := u_{r,0}$.

First we would like to know how fast $\|\nabla'\Delta u_r\|_{L^2(B_1)}$ decays with respect to $\|\nabla'\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)}$, for $r<1$. In particular, it is well known that an inequality

$$\|\nabla'\Delta u(sx)\|_{L^2(B_1)} \le \tau \|\nabla'\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)}, \tag{3.30}$$

for some $0<s,\tau<1$ would provide good decay estimates for $\|\nabla'\Delta u(s^k x)\|_{L^2(B_1)}$, $k\in\mathbb{N}$. By choosing a suitable coordinate system, we succeed to show a weaker version of the desired inequality. This weaker version of (3.30) is good enough to perform an iteration argument to prove the regularity of the free boundary.

First let us observe that $\frac{1}{6}(\eta\cdot x)_+^3 \in \mathscr{B}_\kappa^\varrho(\varepsilon)$ if $|\eta - e_n| \le C_n\varepsilon$, for some dimensional constant C_n.

Definition 3.8. *Let u be the solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem. We say that the coordinate system is normalized with respect to u, if*

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_{\eta\in\mathbb{R}^n,|\eta|=1} &\left\|\nabla'_\eta\Delta\left(u(x)-\frac{1}{6}(\eta\cdot x)_+^3\right)\right\|_{L^2(B_1)}\\ &= \left\|\nabla'_{e_n}\Delta\left(u(x)-\frac{1}{6}(x_n)_+^3\right)\right\|_{L^2(B_1)},\end{aligned}$$

where $\nabla'_\eta := \nabla - (\eta\cdot\nabla)\eta$, and $\nabla' := \nabla'_{e_n}$.

A minimizer η always exists for a function $u\in\mathscr{B}_\kappa^\varrho(\varepsilon)$, and since $\nabla'_{-\eta} = \nabla'_\eta$, $-\eta$ is also a minimizer, thus we always choose a minimizer satisfying the condition $e_n\cdot\eta\ge 0$. A normalized coordinate system always exists by choosing $\eta = e_n$ in the new coordinate system.

Let us also observe that for every $\eta\in\mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\nabla'_\eta\Delta\left(u(x)-\frac{1}{6}(\eta\cdot x)_+^3\right) = \nabla'_\eta\Delta u(x)$$

and

$$\left\|\nabla'_\eta\Delta u\right\|^2_{L^2(B_1)} = \|\nabla\Delta u\|^2_{L^2(B_1)} - \|\eta\cdot\nabla\Delta u\|^2_{L^2(B_1)}.$$

Lemma 3.9. *Assume that $u\in\mathscr{B}_\kappa^\varrho(\varepsilon)$ solves the biharmonic obstacle problem in a fixed coordinate system with basis vectors $\{e_1,...,e_n\}$. Let $\{e_1^1,...,e_n^1\}$ be a normalized coordinate system with respect to u, and assume that $e_n^1\cdot e_n\ge 0$. Then*

$$|e_n - e_n^1| \le C(n)\|\nabla'\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)} \le C(n)\varepsilon,$$

if ε is small, where $C(n)>0$ is a dimensional constant.

Proof. According to Definition 3.8,

$$\|\nabla'_{e_n^1}\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)} = \|\nabla\Delta u - e_n^1(e_n^1\cdot\nabla\Delta u)\|_{L^2(B_1)} \le \|\nabla'\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)}. \tag{3.31}$$

It follows from the triangle inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\frac{\partial\Delta u}{\partial x_n} - (e_n\cdot e_n^1)^2\frac{\partial\Delta u}{\partial x_n}\right\|_{L^2(B_1)} &\le \left\|\frac{\partial\Delta u}{\partial x_n} - (e_n\cdot e_n^1)(e_n^1\cdot\nabla\Delta u)\right\|_{L^2(B_1)}\\ &\quad + \left\|(e_n\cdot e_n^1)(e_n^1\cdot\nabla\Delta u) - (e_n\cdot e_n^1)^2\frac{\partial\Delta u}{\partial x_n}\right\|_{L^2(B_1)}\\ &\le \|\nabla'_{e_n^1}\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)} + (e_n\cdot e_n^1)\|e_n^1\cdot\nabla'\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)} \le 2\|\nabla'\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)},\end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

according to (3.31), and taking into account that $0 \le e_n\cdot e_n^1 \le 1$.

Note that Lemma 3.4 implies that $\left\|\frac{\partial\Delta u}{\partial x_n}\right\|_{L^2(B_1)}$ is uniformly bounded from below, and therefore by choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ small, we may conclude from (3.32) that

$$1-(e_n\cdot e_n^1)^2 \le \frac{2\|\nabla'\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)}}{\left\|\frac{\partial\Delta u}{\partial x_n}\right\|_{L^2(B_1)}} \le C(n)\|\nabla'\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)}.$$

Since $0 \le e_n\cdot e_n^1 \le 1$, we get

$$0 \le 1 - e_n\cdot e_n^1 \le 1-(e_n\cdot e_n^1)^2 \le C(n)\|\nabla'\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)}. \tag{3.33}$$

Denote by $(e_n^1)' := e_n^1 - e_n(e_n\cdot e_n^1)$. It follows from the triangle inequality and (3.31) that

$$\begin{aligned}\|(e_n^1)'(e_n^1\cdot\nabla\Delta u)\|_{L^2(B_1)} &\le \|\nabla'\Delta u - (e_n^1)'(e_n^1\cdot\nabla\Delta u)\|_{L^2(B_1)}\\ +\|\nabla'\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)} &\le \|\nabla'_{e_n^1}\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \|\nabla'\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)} \le 2\|\nabla'\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$|(e_n^1)'| \le \frac{2\|\nabla'\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)}}{\|e_n^1\cdot\nabla\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)}}.$$

Let us choose $\varepsilon > 0$ small, then $\|e_n^1\cdot\nabla\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)}$ is bounded from below by a dimensional constant according to Lemma 3.4 and inequality (3.33). Therefore we obtain

$$|(e_n^1)'| \le C(n)\|\nabla'\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)}. \tag{3.34}$$

Note that

$$|e_n - e_n^1| \le |1 - e_n\cdot e_n^1| + |(e_n^1)'|.$$

Applying inequalities (3.33) and (3.34) we obtain the desired inequality,

$$|e_n - e_n^1| \le C(n)\|\nabla'\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)} \le C(n)\varepsilon,$$

and the proof of the lemma is now complete.

□

Lemma 3.9 provides an essential estimate, which will be useful in our later discussion.

Proposition 3.10. *For any fixed $0 < s < \tau < 1$ and $\delta > 0$, there exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\delta, \tau, s)$, such that if $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon(\delta, \tau, s)$, then for any $u \in \mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(\varepsilon)$*

$$\|\nabla' \Delta u_s\|_{L^2(B_1)} \leq \tau \|\nabla' \Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \delta \|\nabla' u\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}, \tag{3.35}$$

in a normalized coordinate system with respect to u.

Proof. According to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it is enough to show that the inequality

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \Delta u_s}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{L^2(B_1)} \leq \tau \left\| \frac{\partial \Delta u}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \delta \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}$$

holds for any $i \in \{1, ..., n-1\}$, provided ε is small enough. We argue by contradiction. Assume that there exist $0 < s < \tau < 1$ and $\delta_0 > 0$ for which there exists a sequence of solutions $\{u^j\} \subset \mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(\varepsilon_j)$ in a normalized coordinate system, such that $\varepsilon_j \to 0$, as $j \to \infty$, but for some $i \in \{1, 2, ..., n-1\}$

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \Delta u^j_s}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{L^2(B_1)} > \tau \left\| \frac{\partial \Delta u^j}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \delta_0 \left\| \frac{\partial u^j}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}. \tag{3.36}$$

Let v^j_i be given by (3.19), then according to Lemma 3.6, $v^j_i \to v^0_i$ in $W^{2,2}(B_1)$. Dividing equation (3.36) by δ^j_i, we see that $\|\Delta v^j_i(sx)\|_{L^2(B_1)} \geq \delta_0$. Hence

$$\|\Delta v^j_i\|_{L^2(B_1)} \geq s^{\frac{n}{2}} \|\Delta v^j_i(sx)\|_{L^2(B_1)} \geq s^{\frac{n}{2}} \delta_0,$$

and after passing to the limit as $j \to \infty$, we obtain $\|\Delta v^0_i\|_{L^2(B_1)} \geq s^{\frac{n}{2}} \delta_0$.

According to Lemma 3.6, Δv^0_i is a harmonic function in $\{x_n > 0\} \cap B_1$. Therefore it may be written as a sum of homogeneous orthogonal harmonic polynomials

$$\Delta v^0_i(x) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a^m_i(x),$$

where m indicates the degree of the polynomial a^m_i.

Next we show that $a^0_i = 0$, using the definition of a normalized coordinate system. Consider the following direction

$$\eta^j_i := \left(0, ..., \delta^j_i a^0_i, ..., 0, \lambda^j\right) = \delta^j_i a^0_i e_i + \lambda^j e_n$$

where $\lambda^j > 0$, is chosen so that $|\eta^j_i| = 1$, and since $\delta^j_i \to 0$, we may conclude that $\lambda^j \to 1$.

By the normalization of the coordinate system, Definition 3.8, it follows that

$$\|\nabla'_{\eta^j_i} \Delta u^j\|^2_{L^2(B_1)} \geq \|\nabla' \Delta u^j\|^2_{L^2(B_1)},$$

or equivalently

$$\|\nabla \Delta u^j - \eta^j_i (\eta^j_i \cdot \nabla \Delta u^j)\|^2_{L^2(B_1)} \geq \|\nabla \Delta u^j - e_n (e_n \cdot \nabla \Delta u^j)\|^2_{L^2(B_1)}. \tag{3.37}$$

Expanding (3.37) in coordinates, and taking into account that $\frac{\partial \Delta u^j}{\partial x_i} = \delta_i^j \Delta v_i^j$, we get

$$\sum_{l\neq i,n} (\delta_l^j)^2 \left\|\Delta v_l^j\right\|^2_{L^2(B_1)} + (\delta_i^j)^2 \left\|\Delta v_i^j - a_i^0(\eta_i^j \cdot \nabla \Delta u^j)\right\|^2_{L^2(B_1)}$$
$$+ \left\|\frac{\partial \Delta u^j}{\partial x_n} - \lambda^j(\eta_i^j \cdot \nabla \Delta u^j)\right\|^2_{L^2(B_1)} \geq \sum_{l=1}^{n-1} (\delta_l^j)^2 \left\|\Delta v_l^j\right\|^2_{L^2(B_1)}.$$

The substitution

$$\eta_i^j \cdot \nabla \Delta u^j = a_i^0 (\delta_i^j)^2 \Delta v_i^j + \lambda^j \frac{\partial \Delta u^j}{\partial x_n}$$

leads to

$$(\delta_i^j)^2 \left\|\left(1 - (a_i^0 \delta_i^j)^2\right) \Delta v_i^j - a_i^0 \lambda^j \frac{\partial \Delta u^j}{\partial x_n}\right\|^2_{L^2(B_1)}$$
$$+ \left\|\left(1 - (\lambda^j)^2\right) \frac{\partial \Delta u^j}{\partial x_n} - \lambda^j a_i^0 (\delta_i^j)^2 \Delta v_i^j\right\|^2_{L^2(B_1)} \geq (\delta_i^j)^2 \left\|\Delta v_i^j\right\|^2_{L^2(B_1)}.$$

Dividing the last inequality by $(\delta_i^j)^2$, and taking into account that $1 - (\lambda^j)^2 = (a_i^0 \delta_i^j)^2$, we obtain

$$(\lambda^j)^2 \left\|\lambda^j \Delta v_i^j - a_i^0 \frac{\partial \Delta u^j}{\partial x_n}\right\|^2_{L^2(B_1)} + (1 - (\lambda^j)^2) \left\|\lambda^j \Delta v_i^j - a_i^0 \frac{\partial \Delta u^j}{\partial x_n}\right\|^2_{L^2(B_1)}$$
$$\geq \left\|\Delta v_i^j\right\|^2_{L^2(B_1)}.$$

Hence

$$\left\|\lambda^j \Delta v_i^j - a_i^0 \frac{\partial \Delta u^j}{\partial x_n}\right\|^2_{L^2(B_1)} \geq \left\|\Delta v_i^j\right\|^2_{L^2(B_1)}. \tag{3.38}$$

Lemma 3.4 implies that $\frac{\partial \Delta u^j}{\partial x_n} \to \chi_{B_1^+}$ in $L^2(B_1)$, and according to Lemma 3.6, $\Delta v_i^j \to \Delta v_i^0$ in $L^2(B_1)$ as $j \to \infty$, and $v_i^0 = 0$ in $B_1 \setminus B_1^+$. Therefore we may pass to the limit in the inequality (3.38), and obtain

$$\left\|\Delta v_i^0 - a_i^0\right\|^2_{L^2(B_1^+)} \geq \left\|\Delta v_i^0\right\|^2_{L^2(B_1^+)}. \tag{3.39}$$

Now let us recall that $\Delta v_i^0 = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_i^m$, where a_i^m are orthogonal homogeneous polynomials of degree m. Therefore (3.39) is equivalent to the following inequality

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \|a_i^m\|^2_{L^2(B_1^+)} \geq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \|a_i^m\|^2_{L^2(B_1^+)},$$

which implies that $a_i^0 = 0$.

Now let τ and s be the numbers in (3.36), and let us observe that

$$\Delta v_i^0(sx) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_i^m(sx) = s \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} s^{m-1} a_i^m(x),$$

and therefore for any $0 < s < 1$

$$\|\Delta v_i^0(sx)\|^2_{L^2(B_1)} \leq s^2 \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \|a_i^m\|^2_{L^2(B_1)} = s^2 \|\Delta v_i^0\|^2_{L^2(B_1)}.$$

Then according to the strong convergence $\|\Delta v_i^j\|_{L^2(B_1)} \to \|\Delta v_i^0\|_{L^2(B_1)}$, and taking into account that $\|\Delta v_i^0\|_{L^2(B_1)} \geq s^{\frac{n}{2}}\delta_0 > 0$, we obtain

$$\|\Delta v_i^j(sx)\|_{L^2(B_1)} \leq \tau \|\Delta v_i^j\|_{L^2(B_1)},$$

for $j > 1$ large enough. Hence we may conclude that

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \Delta u^j}{\partial x_i}(sx) \right\|_{L^2(B_1)} \leq \tau \left\| \frac{\partial \Delta u^j}{\partial x_i} \right\|_{L^2(B_1)},$$

contradicting (3.36).

□

3.5 $C^{1,\alpha}$-regularity of the free boundary

In this section we perform an iteration argument, based on Proposition 3.7, Proposition 3.10, and Lemma 3.9, that leads to the existence of the unit normal η_0 of the free boundary at the origin, and provides good decay estimates for $\|\nabla'_{\eta_0} u_r\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)}$.

First we would like to verify that $u \in \mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(\varepsilon)$ imply that $u_s \in \mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(C\varepsilon)$. It is easy to check that the property of being an NTA domain is scaling invariant, in the sense that if D is an NTA domain and $0 \in \partial D$, then for any $0 < s < 1$ the set $D_s := s^{-1}(D \cap B_s)$ is also an NTA domain with the same parameters as D.

Assumption 3 in Definition 3.3 holds for u_s according to Corollary 3.5. Indeed, let $t = s$ in Corollary 3.5, then $u(sx) = 0$ if $x_n < -1$.

Thus u_s satisfies 2, 3 in Definition 3.3, but it may not satisfy 4. Instead we consider rescaled solutions defined as follows

$$U_s(x) := \frac{\omega_n u_s(x)}{\|D^3 u_s\|_{L^2(B_1)}}, \tag{3.40}$$

then assumption 4 also holds. Indeed, $\|D^3 U_s\|_{L^2(B_1)} = \omega_n$ by definition of U_s, and

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^3 U_s\|_{L^2(B_2)} = \frac{\omega_n \|D^3 u_s\|_{L^2(B_2)}}{\|D^3 u_s\|_{L^2(B_1)}} &= \frac{\omega_n \|D^3 u\|_{L^2(B_{2s})}}{\|D^3 u\|_{L^2(B_s)}} \\ &\leq \omega_n \frac{\omega_n (2s)^{\frac{n}{2}} + \sigma(\varepsilon)}{\omega_n (s)^{\frac{n}{2}} - \sigma(\varepsilon)} < \kappa, \end{aligned}$$

according to Lemma 3.4 provided $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n, \kappa, s)$ is small.

In the next lemma we show that $U_s \in \mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(\tau\varepsilon)$ in a normalized coordinate system, then we argue inductively to show that $U_{s^k} \in \mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(C\beta^k\varepsilon)$, $\beta < 1$.

Lemma 3.11. *Assume that $u \in \mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(\varepsilon)$ solves the biharmonic obstacle problem in a normalized coordinate system $\{e_1, e_2, ..., e_n\}$. Let $0 < \alpha < 1$ be a number.*

Then there exists a unit vector $\eta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, such that $|\eta_0 - e_n| \le C\varepsilon$, and for any $0 < r < 1$

$$\frac{\|\nabla'_{\eta_0} u_r\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)}}{\|D^3 u_r\|_{L^2(B_1)}} \le C r^\alpha \varepsilon, \tag{3.41}$$

provided $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n, \kappa, \varrho, \alpha)$ is small enough. The constant $C > 0$ depends on the space dimension n and on the given parameters α, κ, ϱ.

Proof. Throughout $\{e_1, ..., e_n\}$ is a fixed coordinate system normalized with respect to the solution $u \in \mathscr{B}^\varrho_\kappa(\varepsilon)$, and $\nabla' u = \nabla'_{e_n} u$. We may renormalize the coordinate system with respect to U_s and denote by $\{e_1^1, ..., e_n^1\}$ the set of basis vectors in the new system. Inductively, $\{e_1^k, ..., e_n^k\}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is a normalized system with respect to U_{s^k}, and $e_i^0 := e_i$. According to Lemma 3.9,

$$|e_n^k - e_n^{k-1}| \le C(n) \frac{\|\nabla'_{e_n^{k-1}} \Delta u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)}}{\|D^3 u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)}}, \tag{3.42}$$

provided $\|\nabla'_{e_n^{k-1}} U_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}$ is sufficiently small.

Let us fix $\frac{1}{4} < s < \frac{1}{2}$, then for any $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|\eta| = 1$ the following inequality holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla'_\eta u_{s^{k+1}}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)} \le C_P(\varrho, n) \|D^2 \nabla'_\eta u_{s^{k+1}}\|_{L^2(B_2)} \\ \le C_P(\varrho, n) s^{-\frac{n}{2}} \|D^2 \nabla'_\eta u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)} \le C(\varrho, n) \|\nabla'_\eta u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)} \end{aligned} \tag{3.43}$$

where we used the Poincaré inequality in the first step for the function $\nabla'_\eta u_{s^{k+1}}$.

From now on $\frac{1}{4} < s < \beta < 1/2$ are fixed constants, τ and γ are arbitrary constants satisfying

$$\frac{1}{4} < s < \tau < \gamma < \beta < \frac{1}{2}. \tag{3.44}$$

Let $c(\delta) > 0$ be the constant in Proposition 3.7, with $\delta > 0$ to be chosen later. Then

$$\|\nabla' u\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)} \le c(\delta) \|\nabla' \Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \delta \|\nabla' u\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}. \tag{3.45}$$

Denote by

$$\lambda := \frac{c(\delta) C(\varrho, n)}{\gamma - \tau},$$

where τ, γ are the constants in (3.44), and $C(\varrho, n)$ is the same constant as in (3.43). Take $\delta_0 = \frac{\delta}{\lambda}$ in Proposition 3.10, and $\varepsilon \le \varepsilon(\min(\delta_0, \delta))$, then

$$\|\nabla' \Delta u_s\|_{L^2(B_1)} \le \tau \|\nabla' \Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \delta_0 \|\nabla' u\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}. \tag{3.46}$$

According to our choice of e_n^1 and inequality (3.43), we obtain from (3.45) and (3.46)

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \|\nabla'_{e_n^1} \Delta u_s\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \|\nabla' u_s\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)} \le \lambda \|\nabla' \Delta u_s\|_{L^2(B_1)} \\ + C(\varrho, s, n) \|\nabla' u\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)} \le (\lambda\tau + c(\delta) C(\varrho, s, n)) \|\nabla' \Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)} \\ + (\lambda\delta_0 + C(\varrho, s, n)\delta) \|\nabla' u\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)} = \lambda\gamma \|\nabla' \Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)} \\ + \delta(1 + C(\varrho, s, n)) \|\nabla' u\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $\delta \le \frac{1}{1+C(\varrho,s,n)}$, then

$$\lambda\|\nabla'_{e_n^1}\Delta u_s\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \|\nabla' u_s\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)} \le \gamma\left(\lambda\|\nabla'\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \|\nabla' u\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}\right). \tag{3.47}$$

Now let us consider the sequence of numbers $\{A_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$, defined as follows:

$$A_0 := \frac{\lambda\|\nabla'\Delta u\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \|\nabla' u\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}}{\|D^3 u\|_{L^2(B_1)}},$$

and

$$A_k := \frac{\lambda\|\nabla'_{e_n^k}\Delta u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \|\nabla'_{e_n^{k-1}} u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}}{\|D^3 u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)}}, \text{ for } k = 1, 2, ... \tag{3.48}$$

The assumption $u \in \mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(\varepsilon)$ implies that

$$A_0 \le \frac{\lambda+1}{\omega_n}\varepsilon.$$

Let us also observe that

$$\frac{\|D^3 u\|_{L^2(B_1)}}{\|D^3 u_s\|_{L^2(B_1)}} = \frac{s^{\frac{n}{2}}\|D^3 u\|_{L^2(B_1)}}{\|D^3 u\|_{L^2(B_s)}} \le \frac{s^{\frac{n}{2}}\omega_n}{s^{\frac{n}{2}}\omega_n - \sigma(A_0)} \le \frac{\beta}{\gamma}.$$

according to Lemma 3.4, since A_0 is small. Hence the inequality (3.47) implies that

$$A_1 = \frac{\lambda\|\nabla'_{e_n^1}\Delta u_s\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \|\nabla' u_s\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}}{\|D^3 u_s\|_{L^2(B_1)}} \le \gamma A_0 \frac{\|D^3 u\|_{L^2(B_1)}}{\|D^3 u_s\|_{L^2(B_1)}} \le \beta A_0.$$

Thus $A_1 \le \beta A_0$. We use induction to show that

$$A_k \le \beta^k A_0, \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \tag{3.49}$$

for a fixed $\gamma < \beta < 1/2$. Assuming that (3.49) holds up to $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we will show that $A_{k+1} \le \beta^{k+1} A_0$. The proof is quite long and technical.

Recalling our notation (3.40) for U_{s^k}, and notation (3.48) for A_k, we see that

$$\|\nabla'_{e_n^{k-1}} U_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)} = \frac{\omega_n\|\nabla'_{e_n^{k-1}} u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}}{\|D^3 u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)}} \le \omega_n A_k \le \beta^k(\lambda+1)\varepsilon. \tag{3.50}$$

Hence

$$U_{s^k} = \frac{\omega_n u_{s^k}(x)}{\|D^3 u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)}} \in \mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(\beta^k\varepsilon_0)$$

in the coordinate system $\{e_1^{k-1}, ..., e_n^{k-1}\}$, and $\varepsilon_0 = (\lambda+1)\varepsilon$ is small. By definition, $\{e_1^k, ..., e_n^k\}$ is a normalized coordinate system with respect to $U_{s^k} \in \mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(\beta^k\varepsilon_0)$.

The definition of a normalized coordinate system, and inequality (3.43) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{k+1} &= \frac{\lambda\|\nabla'_{e_n^{k+1}}\Delta u_{s^{k+1}}\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \|\nabla'_{e_n^k} u_{s^{k+1}}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}}{\|D^3 u_{s^{k+1}}\|_{L^2(B_1)}} \\ &\le \frac{\lambda\|\nabla'_{e_n^k}\Delta u_{s^{k+1}}\|_{L^2(B_1)} + C(\varrho,s,n)\|\nabla'_{e_n^k} u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)}}{\|D^3 u_{s^{k+1}}\|_{L^2(B_1)}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.51}$$

Applying Proposition 3.7 for the function $U_{s^k} \in \mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(\beta^k\varepsilon_0)$, we obtain

$$\|\nabla'_{e_n^k} u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)} \le c(\delta)\|\nabla'_{e_n^k}\Delta u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \delta\|\nabla'_{e_n^k} u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}. \tag{3.52}$$

It follows from Proposition 3.10 and our choice of the coordinate system $\{e_1^k, ..., e_n^k\}$, that

$$\|\nabla'_{e_n^k}\Delta u_{s^{k+1}}\|_{L^2(B_1)} \le \tau\|\nabla'_{e_n^k}\Delta u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \delta_0\|\nabla'_{e_n^k} u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}, \tag{3.53}$$

where $\delta, c(\delta)$ and δ_0 are the same numbers as before.

Combining inequalities (3.51), (3.52) and (3.53), we derive the following estimate for A_{k+1},

$$A_{k+1} \le \frac{\lambda\gamma\|\nabla'_{e_n^k}\Delta u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \delta(1+C(\varrho,n))\|\nabla'_{e_n^k} u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}}{\|D^3 u_{s^{k+1}}\|_{L^2(B_1)}}. \tag{3.54}$$

It follows from the triangle inequality and Lemma 3.9 that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla'_{e_n^k} u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)} &\le \|\nabla'_{e_n^{k-1}} u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)} + 2|e_n^k - e_n^{k-1}|\|\nabla u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}\\ &\le \|\nabla'_{e_n^{k-1}} u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)} + 2C(n)\frac{\|\nabla'_{e_n^{k-1}} u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}}{\|D^3 u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)}}\|\nabla u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}\\ &\le C'(\varrho,n)\|\nabla'_{e_n^{k-1}} u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}.\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality and (3.54) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}A_{k+1} &\le \frac{\lambda\gamma\|\nabla'_{e_n^k}\Delta u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \delta C'(\varrho,n)(1+C(\varrho,n))\|\nabla'_{e_n^{k-1}} u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}}{\|D^3 u_{s^{k+1}}\|_{L^2(B_1)}}\\ &\le \frac{\lambda\gamma\|\nabla'_{e_n^k}\Delta u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)} + \gamma\|\nabla'_{e_n^{k-1}} u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}}{\|D^3 u_{s^{k+1}}\|_{L^2(B_1)}} = \gamma A_k\frac{\|D^3 u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)}}{\|D^3 u_{s^{k+1}}\|_{L^2(B_1)}}\end{aligned} \tag{3.55}$$

if

$$\delta \le \frac{\gamma}{C'(\varrho,n)(1+C(\varrho,n))},$$

independent of $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

In order to complete the induction argument, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\|D^3 u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)}}{\|D^3 u_{s^{k+1}}\|_{L^2(B_1)}} &= \frac{s^{\frac{n}{2}}\|D^3 u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)}}{\|D^3 u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_s)}}\\ &\le \frac{s^{\frac{n}{2}}\omega_n}{s^{\frac{n}{2}}\omega_n - \sigma(\beta^k A_0)} \le \frac{\beta}{\gamma},\end{aligned} \tag{3.56}$$

according to Lemma 3.4, since $U_{s^k} \in \mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(\beta^k\varepsilon_0)$ and $\beta^k\varepsilon_0 < \varepsilon_0$ is small. Finally we obtain from (3.55) and (3.56) that

$$A_{k+1} \le \beta A_k \le \beta^{k+1} A_0, \tag{3.57}$$

this completes the proof of inequality (3.49).

Next we can show that $\{e_n^k\}$ is a Cauchy sequence by using (3.42) and (3.49). Indeed for any $m, k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|e_n^{k+m} - e_n^k| \le \sum_{l=1}^{m} |e_n^{k+l} - e_n^{k+l-1}| \le C(n) \sum_{l=1}^{m} \|\nabla'_{e_n^{k+l-1}} \Delta U_{s^{k+l}}\|_{L^2(B_1)}$$
$$\le C(n) \sum_{l=1}^{m} A_{k+l} \le \frac{C(n)A_0}{\lambda} \sum_{l=1}^{m} \beta^{k+l} \le \frac{C(n)A_0}{\lambda(1-\beta)} \beta^k,$$

hence $e_n^k \to \eta_0$, as $k \to \infty$ for some $\eta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|\eta_0| = 1$ and

$$|\eta_0 - e_n^k| \le C(n, \lambda) A_0 \beta^k \le C'(n, \lambda) \beta^k \varepsilon, \tag{3.58}$$

in particular $|\eta_0 - e_n| \le C'(n, \lambda)\varepsilon$.

Combining (3.49) and (3.58), we may conclude that

$$\frac{\|\nabla'_{\eta_0} \Delta u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)}}{\|D^3 u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)}} \le C\beta^k \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\|\nabla'_{\eta_0} u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)}}{\|D^3 u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)}} \le C\beta^k \varepsilon, \tag{3.59}$$

where the constant $C > 0$ depends only on the space dimension and on the given parameters ϱ and $0 < s < \tau < \gamma < \beta < 1/2$.

The inequality (3.41) follows from (3.59) via a standard iteration argument. Let $0 < \alpha < 1$ be any number, fix $1/4 < s < 1/2$, and take $\beta = s^\alpha > s$. If $0 < r < 1$, then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, such that $s^{k+1} \le r < s^k$. Hence

$$\frac{\|\nabla'_{\eta_0} u_r\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)}}{\|D^3 u_r\|_{L^2(B_1)}} \le C \frac{\|\nabla'_{\eta_0} u_{s^k}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)}}{\|D^3 u_{s^k}\|_{L^2(B_1)}} \le C\beta^k \varepsilon = Cs^{\alpha k}\varepsilon \le C(n, \varrho, \alpha) r^\alpha \varepsilon. \tag{3.60}$$

□

Now we are ready to prove the $C^{1,\alpha}$-regularity of the free boundary.

Theorem 3.12. *Assume that $u \in \mathscr{B}_\kappa^\varrho(\varepsilon)$, with an $\varepsilon > 0$ small. Then $\Gamma_u \cap B_1$ is a $C^{1,\alpha}$-graph for any $0 < \alpha < 1$ and the $C^{1,\alpha}$-norm of the graph is bounded by $C\varepsilon$.*

Proof. Let $0 < \alpha < 1$ be any number, fix $1/4 < s < 1/2$, and take $\beta = s^\alpha > s$. It follows from Lemma 3.11 that for $u \in \mathscr{B}_\kappa^\varrho(\varepsilon)$

$$\frac{\|\nabla' u_r\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)}}{\|D^3 u_r\|_{L^2(B_1)}} \le Cr^\alpha \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad r \to 0,$$

after a change of variable, by choosing $e_n = \eta_0$, where η_0 is the same vector as in Lemma 3.11. Then

$$\frac{\omega_n u_r(x)}{\|D^3 u_r\|_{L^2(B_1)}} \to \frac{1}{6}(x_n)_+^3$$

according to Lemma 3.4.

So we have shown that in the initial coordinate system,

$$\frac{\omega_n u(rx)}{r^3 \|D^3 u_r\|_{L^2(B_1)}} \to \frac{1}{6}(\eta_0 \cdot x)_+^3 \text{ in } W^{3,2}(B_1) \cap C^{1,\alpha}(B_1), \text{ as } r \to 0, \tag{3.61}$$

and therefore η_0 is the measure theoretic normal to Γ_u at the origin.

Now let $x_0 \in \Gamma_u \cap B_1$ be a free boundary point, and consider the function $u_{x_0,1/2}(x) = \frac{u(x/2+x_0)}{(1/2)^3}, x \in B_2$, then

$$U_{x_0}(x) := \frac{\omega_n u_{x_0,1/2}(x)}{\|D^3 u_{x_0,1/2}\|_{L^2(B_1)}} \in \mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(C(n)\varepsilon).$$

According to Lemma 3.11, U_{x_0} has a unique blow-up

$$U_{r,x_0}(x) := \frac{U_{x_0}(rx)}{r^3} = \frac{\omega_n u_{x_0,1/2}(rx)}{r^3\|D^3 u_{x_0,1/2}(rx)\|_{L^2(B_1)}} \to \frac{1}{6}(\eta_{x_0}\cdot x)^3_+.$$

and therefore η_{x_0} is the normal to Γ_u at x_0.

Next we show that η_x is a Hölder continuous function on $\Gamma_u \cap B_1$. If $x_0 \in \Gamma_u \cap B_1$, then $s^{k+1} < |x_0| \le s^k$, for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Hence $\|\nabla'_{\eta_0} U_{s^k,x_0}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)} \le C\beta^k\varepsilon$, and $\|\nabla'_{\eta_{x_0}} U_{r,x_0}\|_{W^{2,2}(B_1)} \to 0$ as $r \to 0$. Applying Lemma 3.11 for the function $U_{s^k,x_0} \in \mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(C\beta^k\varepsilon)$, we obtain

$$|\eta_{x_0} - \eta_0| \le C\beta^k\varepsilon \le \frac{C}{\beta}|x_0|^\alpha\varepsilon. \tag{3.62}$$

Furthermore, the inequality

$$|\eta_x - \eta_y| \le C|x-y|^\alpha\varepsilon, \quad \text{for any } x, y \in \Gamma_u$$

follows from (3.62).

□

4 On the regularity of the solution

In this section we study the regularity of the solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem. Assuming that $u \in \mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(\varepsilon)$, with $\varepsilon > 0$ small, we derive from Theorem 3.12 that $u \in C^{2,1}_{loc}(B_1)$. In the end we provide an example showing that without the NTA domain assumption, there exist solutions, that are not $C^{2,1}$.

4.1 $C^{2,1}$-regularity of the solutions in $\mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(\varepsilon)$

After showing the $C^{1,\alpha}$-regularity of the free boundary $\Gamma_u \cap B_1$, we may go further to derive improved regularity for the solution $u \in \mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(\varepsilon)$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $u \in \mathscr{B}^{\varrho}_{\kappa}(\varepsilon)$ be the solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem in $\Omega \supset\supset B_2$, and let $0 < \alpha < 1$ be a fixed number. Then $u \in C^{2,1}(B_{1/4})$, provided $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\kappa, \varrho, \alpha)$ is small. Furthermore, the following estimate holds*

$$\|u\|_{C^{3,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}_u \cap B_{1/4})} \le C(n)\|u\|_{W^{2,2}(B_2)} \le C(n)\kappa,$$

where $C(n)$ is just a dimensional constant.

Proof. According to Theorem 3.12, $\Gamma_u \cap B_1$ is a graph of a $C^{1,\alpha}$-function. We know that $\Delta u \in W^{1,2}(B_2)$ is a harmonic function in $\Omega_u := \{u > 0\}$, and also $u \in W^{3,2}(B_2)$, $u \equiv 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \Omega_u$, hence $\Delta u = 0$ on $\Gamma_u = \partial\Omega_u \cap B_2$ in the

trace sense. Therefore we may apply Corollary 8.36 in [8], to conclude that $\Delta u \in C^{1,\alpha}((\Omega_u \cup \Gamma_u) \cap B_{3/4})$, and

$$\|\Delta u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}_u \cap B_{3/4})} \leq C(n)\|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}. \tag{4.1}$$

It follows from the Calderón-Zygmund estimates that $u \in W^{3,p}(B_{1/2})$, for any $p < \infty$. According to the Sobolev embedding theorem, $u \in C^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2})$, for all $\alpha < 1$, with the following estimate

$$\|u\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega_u} \cap B_{1/2})} \leq C(n)\left(\|\Delta u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}_u \cap B_{3/4})} + \|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{3/4})}\right). \tag{4.2}$$

Denote by $u_{ij} := \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$. Then $u_{ij} \in W^{1,2}(B_1) \cap C^\alpha(\Omega_u \cap B_{3/4})$ is a weak solution of $\Delta u_{ij} = \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_i}$ in $\Omega_u \cap B_{3/4}$, where $f_j := \frac{\partial \Delta u}{\partial x_j} \in C^\alpha(\Omega_u \cap B_{3/4})$. Taking into account that $u_{ij} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega_u \cap B_{1/2}$, we may apply Corollary 8.36 in [8] once again and conclude that

$$\|u_{ij}\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}_u \cap B_{1/4})} \leq C(n)\left(\|u_{ij}\|_{C^0(\overline{\Omega}_u \cap B_{1/2})} + \|\Delta u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}_u \cap B_{3/4})}\right),$$

hence

$$\|D^2 u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}_u \cap B_{1/4})} \leq C_n'\left(\|\Delta u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}_u \cap B_{3/4})} + \|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{3/4})}\right),$$

according to (4.2).

Therefore we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|u\|_{C^{3,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}_u \cap B_{1/4})} &\leq \|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{3/4})} + \|D^2 u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}_u \cap B_{1/4})} \\ &\leq C(n)\left(\|\Delta u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}_u \cap B_{3/4})} + \|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{3/4})}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Taking into account that

$$\|D^3 u\|_{L^\infty(B_{1/4})} \leq \|D^3 u\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}_u \cap B_{1/4})},$$

we see that $u \in C^{2,1}(B_{1/4})$.

□

4.2 In general the solutions are not better that $C^{2,\frac{1}{2}}$

Let us observe that the assumption $u \in \mathscr{B}_\kappa^\varrho(\varepsilon)$ is essential in the proof of $u \in C^{2,1}(B_r)$. The next example shows that without our flatness assumptions there exists a solution to the biharmonic obstacle problem in $\mathbb{R}^2$, that do not possess $C^{2,1}$- regularity.

Example 4.2. *Consider the following function given in polar coordinates in* $\mathbb{R}^2$*,*

$$u(r,\varphi) = r^{\frac{5}{2}}\left(\cos\frac{\varphi}{2} - \frac{1}{5}\cos\frac{5\varphi}{2}\right), \quad r \in [0,1), \quad \varphi \in [-\pi,\pi) \tag{4.3}$$

then $u \in C^{2,\frac{1}{2}}$ *is the solution to the biharmonic zero-obstacle problem in the unit ball* $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$*.*

Proof. It is easy to check that $u \geq 0$, $u(x) = 0$ if and only if $-1 \leq x_1 \leq 0$ and $x_2 = 0$. Hence the set $\Omega_u = \{u > 0\}$ is not an NTA domain, since the complement of Ω_u does not satisfy the corkscrew condition.

Let us show that $\Delta^2 u$ is a nonnegative measure supported on $[-1, 0] \times \{0\}$. For any nonnegative $f \in C_0^\infty(B_1)$, we compute

$$\int_{B_1} \Delta u(x) \Delta f(x) dx = \int_0^1 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} r \Delta f(r, \varphi) \Delta u(r, \varphi) d\varphi dr$$
$$= 6 \int_0^1 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} r^{\frac{3}{2}} \Delta f(r, \varphi) \cos \frac{\varphi}{2} d\varphi dr = 6 \int_0^1 r^{-\frac{1}{2}} f(r, \pi) dr \geq 0,$$

where we used integration by parts, and that f is compactly supported in B_1.

We obtain that u solves the following variational inequality,

$$u \geq 0, \ \Delta^2 u \geq 0, \ u \cdot \Delta^2 u = 0. \tag{4.4}$$

Now we show that u is the unique minimizer to the following zero-obstacle problem: minimize the functional (1.1) over

$$\mathscr{A} := \{v \in W^{2,2}(B_1), v \geq 0, \text{ s.t. } v = u, \frac{\partial v}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial u}{\partial n}, \text{ on } \partial B_1\} \neq \emptyset.$$

According to Lemma 2.1 there exists a unique minimizer, let us call it v. It follows from (4.4), that

$$\int_{B_1} \Delta u \Delta (v - u) = \int_{B_1} (v - u) \Delta^2 u = \int_{B_1} v \Delta^2 u \geq 0.$$

Hence

$$\int_{B_1} (\Delta u)^2 \leq \int_{B_1} \Delta u \Delta v \leq \left(\int_{B_1} (\Delta u)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{B_1} (\Delta v)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where we used the Hölder inequality in the last step. Therefore we obtain

$$\int_{B_1} (\Delta u)^2 \leq \int_{B_1} (\Delta v)^2,$$

thus $u \equiv v$, and u solves the biharmonic zero-obstacle problem in the unit ball.

However $\Delta u = 6 r^{\frac{1}{2}} \cos \frac{\varphi}{2}$, which implies that u is $C^{2, \frac{1}{2}}$, and that the exponent $\frac{1}{2}$ is optimal, in particular u is not $C^{2,1}$.

□

References

[1] Caffarelli Luis A.; Friedman Avner. The obstacle problem for the biharmonic operator. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa*, Cl. Sci. (4) 6, no. 1:151–184., 1979.

[2] Friedman Avner. *Variational principles and free-boundary problems.* A Wiley-Interscience Publication. Pure and Applied Mathematics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1982. ix+710 pp. ISBN: 0-471-86849-3.

[3] Jerison David S.; Kenig Carlos E. Boundary behavior of harmonic functions in nontangentially accessible domains. *Adv. in Math. 46, no. 1, 80–147.*, 1982.

[4] Andersson John; Lindgren Erik and Shahgholian Henrik. Almost everywhere regularity for the free boundary of the normalized p-harmonic obstacle problem.

[5] Lawrence C. Evans. *Partial differential equations.* Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 19. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. xxii+749 pp. ISBN: 978-0-8218-4974-3.

[6] Jens Frehse. On the regularity of the solution of the biharmonic variational inequality. *Manuscripta Math. 9 (1973), 91–103.*

[7] N. S. Landkof. *Foundations of modern potential theory.* Springer-Verlag, 1972. x+424 pp.

[8] Gilbarg David; Trudinger Neil S. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order.* Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001, Reprint of the 1998 edition.